

REMARKS

I. Summary of the Examiner's Action

A. Claim Rejections

As set forth in paragraph 3 on page 3 of the December 29 Office Action, claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 15 – 32 and 34 – 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,114,224 to Miyamoto *et al.* (hereinafter “Miyamoto” or “the Miyamoto patent” in view of United States Patent No. 6,793,350 to Raskar (hereinafter “Raskar” or “the Raskar patent”) and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0202156 to Connelly *et al.* (hereinafter “Connelly” or “the Connelly application”).

As set forth in paragraph 4 on page 7 of the December 29 Office Action, claim 4 stands rejected over Miyamoto in view of Raskar and Connelly as applied to claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 15 – 32 and 34 – 40, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,278,596 to Machtig (hereinafter “Machtig” or “the Machtig patent”).

As set forth in paragraph 5 on page 8 of the December 29 Office Action, claims 7 – 13 and 33 stand rejected as being unpatentable in view of Miyamoto in view of Raskar and Connelly as applied to claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 15 – 32 and 34 – 40, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,431,711 to Pinhanez (hereinafter “Pinhanez” or “the Pinhanez patent”).

These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

II. Applicants' Response

A. Rejection of Claims 1 – 8, 11, 16 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 (as amended) now recites the following subject matter (emphasis added):

1. A positioning system comprising,
at least one mount for mounting a projection unit, the projection unit
comprising at least a projector for receiving a distorted image
generated by a display controller and for projecting the
distorted image; where the at least one mount is coupled to a
mechanism for providing translational movement and
rotational movement for adjusting one of a position and an
orientation of the projection unit to produce from the distorted
image a substantially undistorted image on a surface, and
wherein the translational movement comprises components in
at least two perpendicular directions.

Support for the amendment apparent in the emphasized portion of claim 1 is found throughout the application. Applicants respectfully submit that the emphasized subject matter of claim 1 is neither described nor suggested by art of record.

In particular, claim 1 and the remaining independent claims have been amended to recite additional aspects of Applicants' invention which are described in the application at page 8, line 23 – page 9, line 5 and page 9, line 27 – page 10, line 2 as follows:

“For convenience, it is generally considered that the projection unit 5 includes the projector 3 and a display controller 20. The display controller 20 provides for generation of a distorted image 16. The distorted image 16 is provided to the projector 3 for projection ...

* * *

It is not required that the projection unit 5 has the camera, or other complimentary equipment. Rather, it is preferred that the projection unit 5 be equipped to produce the distorted image 16. Preferably, the distorted image 11 is distorted (‘pre-warped’ or otherwise adjusted) to appear with adequate quality substantially undistorted on surfaces 12, such as those positioned at oblique angles from the position unit 5. Preferably, the positioning system 50 is configured so to steer the distorted image 16 to provide appropriate quality adjustments which produce the substantially undistorted image.”

It is believed that the additional subject matter now recited in the independent claims has not been presented in the prosecution of this application until now. Applicants respectfully submit that the additional subject matter now recited in the independent claims is neither described nor suggested by any of the prior art of record, whether taken singly or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the art of record. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 24, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 and 40 are also allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with respect to claim 1, in addition to reasons attributable to their own independently-recited claim features. Further, dependent claims 2 – 3, 5, 6, 15 – 23, 25 – 29, 36, 38 and 39 are

patentable both as depending – either directly or indirectly – on an allowable independent claim and for reasons having to do with their independently-recited features.

B. Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully submit that Machtig is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of the primary combination. Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable both as depending (indirectly) from claim 1 that is allowable for the foregoing reasons, and for reasons attributable to its independently-recited features. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 4.

C. Rejections of Claim 7 – 13 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully submit that Pinhanez is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of the primary combination. Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 33 is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1 and dependent claims 7 - 13 are patentable both as depending (indirectly) from claim 1, and for reasons attributable to their independently-recited features. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

III. Conclusion

The Applicants submit that in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

August 25, 2008

Date

David M. O'Neill (35,304)

David M. O'Neill (Reg. No. 35,304)

Customer No.: 48237

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: DOneill@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated.

8/25/2008

Date

Clair F. Mian

Name of Person Making Deposit